



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/202,244 02/19/99 BREUNIG

S 022701-803

021839 IM52/0328  
BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS L L P  
POST OFFICE BOX 1404  
ALEXANDRIA VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

MOORE, M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1712  
DATE MAILED:

03/28/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

# Advisory Action

Application No.  
09/202,244

Applicant(s)  
Breunig et al.

Examiner  
Margaret Moore

Group Art Unit  
1712



## THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☐ expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

- ☒ Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on Mar 15, 2001 (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on Mar 15, 2001 has been considered with the following effect, but is **NOT** deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

- ☒ The proposed amendment(s):

☐ will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.

☒ will not be entered because:

☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).

☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).

☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.

☐ they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: This amendment does not overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112, 2nd para, as the metes and bounds of "forming" are undefined; it is not clear what is embraced by this claim. In addition the amendment raises the issue of a new ground of rejection under 35 USC 112 1st para., since "forming" is broader than the specific hydrosilylation reaction enabled by the specification.

- ☐ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):

- ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

- ☒ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
it does not adequately demonstrate any difference between the claimed process and product, and the prior art.

- ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

- ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):

Claims allowed: none

Claims objected to: none

Claims rejected: 1-21

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.

- ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

- ☒ Other For applicants' arguments on page 5 of this response, these points were addressed in the final office action. In the declaration, reference to "the polyorganohydrosiloxane synthesized in the present invention" makes no sense since the present invention makes a functionalized siloxane oil, from a polyorganohydrosiloxane. Also it is unclear how applicants believe this declaration demonstrates any difference

MARGARET MOORE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 1712